



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

|  |               |                      |                     |                  |
|--|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE   | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/554,205   | 12/12/2005    | Tetsuya Suzuki       | 2005_1548A          | 2813             |
| 513  | 7590          | 07/29/2009           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.<br>1030 15th Street, N.W.,<br>Suite 400 East<br>Washington, DC 20005-1503 |               |                      | SUTTON, DARRYL C    |                  |
| ART UNIT   | PAPER NUMBER  |                      |                     |                  |
|  | 1612          |                      |                     |                  |
| MAIL DATE  | DELIVERY MODE |                      |                     |                  |
| 07/29/2009   | PAPER         |                      |                     |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

|                        |                     |  |
|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
| 10/554,205             | SUZUKI, TETSUYA     |  |
| <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
| DARRYL C. SUTTON       | 1612                |  |

**—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —**

THE REPLY FILED 11 June 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 6,7,9-12 and 21-23

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

/Frederick Krass/  
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1612

/Darryl C Sutton/  
 Examiner, Art Unit 1612

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the Examiner has relied on two portions of the general Remington reference to assert that both a wax matrix and an enteric coating would be obvious, although no motivation for this position was provided; and that Remington does not teach the active agent of formula (1). The Examiner disagrees. As cited in the Final office action, Remington teaches four categories of nonimmediate release delivery systems, that wax matrices are used for sustained release of drugs and that drug release can also be controlled by enteric coatings, and the advantages of each method, see page 4, 2nd paragraph. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the two methods in order to control the release of the drug while eliminating or minimizing patient compliance, decrease or eliminate local and systemic side effects and improve efficacy of treatment. Since the rejection is a 103 obviousness rejection, Remington is not required to teach every element of the claims. Applicant argues that Mendes et al. does not teach an enteric coating comprised of methacrylic acid copolymer LD, L, S or combinations thereof or the active agent in a wax matrix coated with an enteric coating. The Examiner disagrees. As cited by the Examiner in the Final office action, Mendes clearly teaches enteric coatings comprised of Eudragit L and LD methacrylic acid copolymers, see page 5, 2nd full paragraph. Since the rejection was a 103 obviousness rejection, Mendes et al. was not required to teach every element of the claims. Applicant argues that Nakamichi is only relied upon to teach mixing ratios of wax and clearly fails to remedy the deficiencies of the above discussed combination of references. The Examiner disagrees. As discussed above, the combined prior art of Abe et al., Remington and Mendes et al. are not deficient and Nakamichi is only required to provide motivation for combining with the prior art. As cited by the Examiner in the Final office action, Nakamichi et al. discloses mixing ratios of drug to wax in wax matrices for controlled release of drugs, see page 7, 1st paragraph. Therefore, Nakamichi et al. provides adequate motivation for combining with the prior art of Abe et al., Remington and Mendes et al.